PART III—Section 2

NOTIFICATIONS BY THE HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MYSORE AT BANGALORE.

Current No. 587—27-28, *dated the* 13*th January* 1936.

SUBJECT:—

Addition of a new clause (ff) to sub-rule (2) of Rule 11 of Order XXI of the First Schedule of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1911.

The following addition which the High Court proposes to make, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 122 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1911, to the said sub-rule, is published, as required by the said section, for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby, and notice is hereby given that the said addition will be taken up for consideration by the High Court on or after the 17th February 1936. Any objection or suggestion which may be received from any person with respect to the proposed addition before the said date will be considered by the High Court.

Proposed Addition.

Add the following new clause (ff) between sub-clauses (f) and (g) to sub-rule (2) of Rule 11 of Order XXI of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1911:—

(ff) "Whether the original decree-holder has transferred any part of his interest in the decree, and if so, the date of the transfer and the name and address of the parties to the transfer."

A. SUNDARARAJA RAO,
Registrar.

IN THE COURT OF THE MUNSIFF AT CHIKBALLAPUR.

Insolvency Case No. 14 *of* 1931-32.

(1) Hanumappa, (2) Channappa, (3) Dodda Munisami, (4) Dodda Muniga .. .. *Petitioners.*

vs.

(1) V. Mugavalappa, (2) Dodda Narayanappa, (3) Ramanna ... *Opponents.*

As the applicants, have not filed the application for final discharge as per orders of the Court, it is ordered that the order of adjudication, dated 17th March 1933, against them is hereby annulled.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court, this 15th day of January 1936.

Insolvency Case No. 20 *of* 1931-32.

(1) Seebiya, (2) Gowramma ... ... *Petitioners.*

vs.

(1) Narayana Rao, (2) Venkatasamappa *alias* Appiya, (3) Gopalappa ... ... *Opponents.*

The petitioners have filed an application on 25th November 1932, for final discharge. Opponents 2 and 3 say that they have no objections, while 2nd opponent has proved his debt, 1st opponent has not taken any steps to prove his debt. So the petitioners are finally discharged.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court, this 11th day of January 1936.

Insolvency Case No 12 *of* 1933-34.

Muddanna ... ... *Petitioner.*

vs.

(1) Rangappa, (2) Rudrappa, (3) Puttarangappa, (4) Muthamma ... ... *Opponents.*

The petitioner has filed an application on 1st June 1934 for final discharge. No creditor has come forward to oppose the application. The petitioner is finally discharged.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court, this 11th day of January 1936.

Insolvency Case No. 19 *of* 1933-34.

Soorasani Venkatappa ... ... *Petitioner.*

vs.

(1) Narayana Raju, (2) Venkatasami, (3) Naranappa, (4) Bayyanna, (5) Venkata Reddy, (6) Chinna Venkatasubbiya, (7) Raju Venkatrayappa, and (8) Govinda Reddy ... .. *Opponents.*

The petitioner has filed an application on 4th January 1935 for final discharge. No creditor has come forward to oppose the application in time. So, the petitioner is finally discharged.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court on 11th day of January 1936.

Insolvency Application No. 4 *of* 1935-36.

(1) Papaiya, son of Muniyappa, Kadrinayakanahalli, Sidlaghatta Taluk, (2) Yellaga, son of Papaiya, residing in the same place ... *Petitioners.*

vs.

(1) Venkatrayappa, (2) Mattappa, (3) Byatappa, (4) Anjinappa ... *Opponents.*

Pursuant to a petition, dated 25th October 1935, againt the opponents and on the application of the petitioner and on reading the same, and hearing both the parties, it is ordered that the debtor be and the said debtor is hereby adjudged insolvent.

Creditors to prove their debts by 31st January 1936.

Dated this 8th day of January 1936.

B. K. RAMAKRISHNAIYA,
Munsiff.

IN THE COURT OF THE FIRST MUNSIFF AT TUMKUR.

Insolvency Case No. 8 *of* 1934-35.

Kallayya, son of Lingegowda, resident of Nademavinapura, Kunigal Taluk, Yediyur Sammath ... ... *Petitioner.*

vs.

Mr. H. Venkata Ramayya, resident of Tumkur ... ... *Opponent.*

Pursuant to a petition, dated 18th December 1934, against the opponent and on the application of the petitioner and on reading the application and hearing both parties, it is ordered that the debtor be and the said debtor is hereby adjudged insolvent.

Dated this 20th day of December 1935.

Proof of debts—four months.

Time for discharge—six months.

Insolvency Case No. 5 *of* 1934-35.

Kalayya, son of Kempayya, resident of Tumkur ... ... *Petitioner*

vs.

(1) T. Guruchannabasavayya, (2) Chicka Rangayya, (3) Holurayya, residents of Tumkur ... ... *Opponents.*

Pursuant to a petition, dated 26th October 1934, against the opponents and on the application of the petitioner and on reading the same, it is ordered that the debtor be and the said debtor is hereby adjudged insolvent.

Dated this 20th day of December 1935.

Proof of debts in four months.

Application for final discharge—six months.

S. KANAKARATNARAJ,
Munsiff.

IN THE COURT OF THE SUBORDINATE JUDGE AT MYSORE.

Insolvency Case No. 49 of 1934-35.

Subbanna, son of Deviah, Landholder and Shanbhog, Heggotara Village, Chamarajnagar Taluk ... ... *Petitioner (Debtor.)*

vs.

Subrahmanya Sastry and others ... ... *Opponents.*

Take notice that the abovenamed insolvent has applied for his discharge and that the Court has fixed the 10th day of February 1936, at 11 o'clock, for hearing the application.

Dated the 13th day of January 1936.

Insolvency Application No. 65 of 1934-35.

M. Lakshmana Rao, 15 years, son of Neelakanta Rao, Mahratta, Mochi Street, Mandi Mohalla, Mysore ... ... *Petitioner. (Debtor.)*

vs.

Sultan Alli Khan and others ... ... *Opponents.*

Pursuant to a petition, dated 22nd January 1935, and on the application of the petitioner, and on reading the application and on examining him, it is ordered that the debtor be and the said debtor is hereby adjudged insolvent.

Dated this 13th day of January 1936.

Time for discharge—six months.

Insolvency Application No. 6 of 1935-36.

Thibbegowda *alias* Hutchegowda, son of Devaraguddiahna Hutchiah, Muthlammanasettihalli, Seringapatam Taluk ... *Petitioner. (Debtor).*

vs.

Puttegowda and others ... ... *Opponents.*

Pursuant to a petition, dated 26th July 1935, and on the application of the petitioner and on reading the application and on examining him, it is ordered that the debtor be and the said debtor is hereby adjudged insolvent.

Dated this 13th day of January 1936.

Time for discharge— six months.

Debts to be proved in three months.

G. PARAMASIVIAH,
Subordinate Judge.

IN THE COURT OF THE MUNSIFF AT DAVANGERE.

Insolvency Application No. 5 of 1933-34.

Matada Mahadevappa, son of Goneppa, resident of Ganganarsi, Harihar Sub-Taluk .. .. *Petitioner.*

vs.

Kalyanaiya and others ... ... *Opponents.*

On the application of the petitioner Matada Mahadevappa, son of Goneppa of Ganganarsi, Harihar Sub-Taluk, and on reading the application of the petitioner, and hearing that the petitioner was absent for examination for final discharge and as petitioner's Counsel retired, it is ordered that the order of adjudication, dated 7th December 1934, against the petitioner, Matada-Mahadevappa of Ganganarsi, Harihar Sub-Taluk, be and the same is hereby annulled.

Dated the 3rd day of January 1936.

C. B. SRINIVASA RAO,
Munsiff.